

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This is a reply to the Office Action dated July 24, 2007.

#### **Status of Claims**

Claims 11-20 and 22-26 are currently pending in this application. Claims 16-19 and 22 are withdrawn. Claims 1-10 and 21 have been canceled. New claims 23-26 are currently added. Claims 11, 13 and 14 are currently amended.

#### **Claim Amendments**

Claim 11, as amended, clarifies that the nonwoven fabric layer and film layer remain *unbonded* in the continuous form wrap, as expressly supported and explained, for example, at page 4, lines 18-20 of the present application. Also, Figure 2 of the present application shows separate layers (14) and (16) of the roll (10), i.e. the continuous form wrap, and transverse perforations (16) for assisting with detachment of the selected portions from the rest of the roll (page 5, lines 26-30).

Claim 13 is editorially amended to clarify that the box *is* the dispenser and the roll form or roll is housed in the box (dispenser), as expressly supported and explained in the present application, such as at page 6, lines 1-5, and as shown in Figure 3.

Claim 14 is editorially amended to recite “roll *form*” to be more consistent with an antecedent provided in prior claim 13.

Claim 23 has the same support as claim 11 of record and the language of “*consisting of a wrap consisting of a nonwoven fabric layer and a coextensive film layer in continuous form...*” is supported, for example, at page 5, lines 26-30 and is illustrated in Figure 2.

Claim 24 has similar support as its parent claim 23 as discussed above and claim 12.

Claim 25 has similar support as its intervening claim 24 and parent claim 23 and amended claim 13 as discussed above.

Claim 26 has similar support as its intervening claims 24-25 and parent claim 23, and amended claim 14 as discussed above.

No new matter has been introduced.

New claim 23 should be considered generic for similar reasons as claim 11 was previously found to be generic, and new claims 24-26 are readable on the elected species of Group I of record. Therefore, new claims 23-26 should be examined at this time for the same

reasons of record applicable to claims 11-15, 20 and 21.

#### Drawing Objection

The objection to the drawings set forth in paragraph 2 at pages 2-3 of the Office Action is moot as claim 21 is not currently pending. Therefore, no corrected drawing sheets should be required in this respect.

Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

#### Written Description Rejection

In paragraph 4 at pages 3-4 of the Office Action, Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Office Action urges that the specification does not teach and makes no mention of providing a dispenser housed in a box, and referencing applicants' specification at page 2, lines 13-14 and Figure 3. The applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

As discussed above, claim 13 has been editorially amended to clarify that the box *is* the dispenser and the roll is housed in the box (dispenser). This arrangement is clearly discussed in the present application, such as at page 6, lines 1-5, and is illustrated in Figure 3. As amended, claim 13 does not require a separate dispenser element that is different from the box, which apparently was the view of the Patent Office with respect to the previous form of this claim.

Therefore, amended claim 13 recites subject matter that is described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Indefiniteness Rejection

In paragraph 6 at page 4 of the Office Action, Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Office Action urges that it is unclear where the wrap is housed as claim 14 teaches a wrap in roll form housed in a box while prior claims 12 and 13 teach a wrap in roll form housed in a dispenser. The applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

As discussed above, claim 13 has been editorially amended to clarify that the box *is* the dispenser and the roll is housed in the box (dispenser). This amendment removes any possible

inconsistency as between claims 13 and 14 regarding the element in which the roll form is housed. Claims 13 and 14 clearly and consistently recite the roll form is housed in the box as the dispenser.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Anticipation Rejection Based On Price et al.

In paragraph 8 at pages 4-5 of the Office Action, Claims 11, 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable by Price et al. (U.S. 6,979,485).

The Office Action urges that Price et al. teach supplying a protective wrap comprising at least a nonwoven fabric layer and a film layer in continuous form (citing col. 7, lines 19-22; col. 8, lines 1-2, Fig. 3), and the wrap is in roll form (citing 98) and contains transversely located perforations (citing 114) at predetermined lengths throughout the wrap, defining multiple sheets that are detachable after dispensing the desired amount of sheets or the desired length of wrap (citing col. 8, lines 48-52; col. 14, lines 15-21; Fig. 15). The applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

The present invention relates to a method of supplying medical wrap in continuous form, comprising the steps including providing a wrap comprising at least one nonwoven fabric layer and a coextensive film layer in continuous form, wherein the nonwoven fabric layer and film layer remain unbonded in the continuous form. Other steps of the method include providing transversely located weakened attachment points positioned at pre-determined lengths throughout the wrap, which define multiple detachable wrap segments in the wrap; and providing the wrap with detachable segments in a dispensible form selected from the group consisting of roll form and fan-folded form, wherein the dispensible form is adapted to dispense multiple segments at once. The present inventors have found that in embodiments of the present invention that a nonwoven fabric and film layer of the continuous form do not need to be bonded together in order to effectively implement the inventive method of supplying medical wrap in continuous form. As explained in the present application, the use of the medical wrap in continuous form according to the present invention is more convenient and advantageous than dispensing single sheets one at a time (page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 7; page 4, line 20 to page 5, line 6).

Price et al. teaches a disposable cutting sheet for cutting and preparation of food items, such as for cutting meat and vegetables (abstract; col. 4, lines 60-62). Price et al. teaches the cutting sheet requires at least three layers, including a cut-resistant top layer, an absorbent middle

layer for collection of liquids, and a slip resistant bottom layer (col. 4, line 54 to col. 5, line 22; col. 13, line 53 to col. 14, line 21; Figs. 3, 14-15). According to Price et al., it is imperative from safety and hygienic standpoints that the cutting sheet does not leak or allow transfer of materials onto or from the work surface (col. 5, lines 14-22). Price et al. teaches that the two outer ply layers (100, 106) of the cutting sheet construct are *directly sealed* together along the length of the roll (109) up to a point adjacent the intermediate absorbent layer 104 (col. 14, lines 1-5). Further, Price et al. teaches that preferably bands of glue are also placed across the width of the roll (98) in order to “... *form a complete seal 110 around the absorbent layer 104*” (emphasis added)(col. 14, lines 6-18).

At a minimum, Price et al. is understood to require *direct bonding* of the outer layers of the cutting sheet thereof at least along the length of the roll to meet the requirements of the food processing product taught by the Price et al. reference.

As noted above, present claim 11 (and new claim 23) recite, among other things, that the nonwoven fabric layer and film layer remain unbonded in the continuous form. Price et al. fail to teach this feature.

Moreover, as explained above, Price et al. *teaches away* from unbonded multiple layer arrangements by requiring direct bonding of the outer layers of the cutting sheet.

In view of at least the above, the applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-13 are not anticipated by Price et al.

The applicants also respectfully submit that new claim 23 and its dependent claims 24-25 are not anticipated by, nor obvious over, Price et al. for at least the same reasons as explained relative to claims 11-13, and reference is made thereto. Moreover, new claim 23 (and its dependent claims) is even further differentiated from Price et al. as present claim 23 excludes three-layer sheet arrangements of a continuous form that are taught and required by Price et al.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Obviousness Rejection Based On Price et al. and Roman

In paragraph 10 at page 6 of the Office Action, Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price et al. as applied to claim 11, and further in view of Roman (U.S. 3,750,873).

The Office Action indicates that Price et al. teach providing a roll (citing 98) in a box with a cutter bar (no reference citation(s) provided), but that Price et al. does not specifically

teach a box with a serrated outer edge operable to detach a portion of the wrap from the remainder of the roll housed in the box. The Office Action urges that it would have been obvious to provide such a box in Price et al. in view of Roman's teachings (abstract; col. 2, lines 21-26; Fig. 3). The applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

As to the Office Action's assertion that Price et al. teaches providing a roll (98) in a box with a cutter bar, the reference is apparently being made to col. 13, lines 57-58. However, as indicated in the Price et al. reference, the box and cutter bar are not illustrated, and no details are provided on what Price et al. specifically intended by this reference.

With respect to Roman, Roman teaches a cooking or sterilizing bag or bag roll of two films with one being heat resistant plastic film and the other being a metallic foil with:

*"... at least two opposite edges secured together with an adhesive..."*

(emphasis added)(col. 1, lines 13-18, 32-35).

Although Roman refer to an embodiment where a bag strip of the two films is rolled on a core and sold in box with a sharp cutting edge (col. 2, lines 21-24, claim 2), that embodiment of Roman also requires adhesively bonded films as the roll material.

As with Price et al., Roman teaches away from the present invention by teaching use of bonded films.

In view of at least the above, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is not obvious over Price et al. and Roman.

The applicants also respectfully submit that new claim 26 is not obvious over the above-discussed combination of Price et al. with Roman for at least the same reasons as explained relative to claim 14, and reference is made thereto.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection Based On Price et al. and Steiner

In paragraph 11 at pages 6-7 of the Office Action, Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price et al. as applied to claim 11, and further in view of Steiner (U.S. 1,877,610).

The Office Action is understood to indicate that Price et al. do not specifically teach a roll adjoined to a table, but that use of such an arrangement to dispense sheets would have been obvious in view of Steiner. The applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

The appliance taught by Steiner teaches away from the present invention. In col. 2, lines 59-63, Steiner et al. teaches that a loose sheet is difficult to use and goes onto say that his invention eliminate the need for a loose sheet. The Steiner reference is therefore teaching a sheet that is used under patients and is therefore an appliance for securing the sheet over the table by using one roll on either end of the table and a crank to advance the paper. This context has no relationship to the cutting sheets of Price et al., and one of ordinary skill in the art would not have reasonably considered looking to Steiner as a source of possible improvements applicable to Price et al.'s food cutting sheet dispensing system, e.g., the non-depicted box referenced at col. 13, lines 57-58.

Furthermore, Steiner refers to a single “web of cleaning sheet 9” (page 2, line 22), and Steiner thus does not teach use of unbonded multiple webs or films, nor that such unbonded sheet constructs can be dispensed by his appliance.

In view of at least the above, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is not obvious over Price et al. and Steiner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection Based On Price et al. and Arco et al.

In paragraph 12 at page 7 of the Office Action, Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price et al. as applied to claim 11, and further in view of Arco et al. (U.S. 4,627,427).

Arco et al. specifically refer to a “sandwich laminate”, and “polymeric binding” of webs to thermoplastic films in providing the draping material described in that reference (col. 5, lines 5-13). As with Price et al. and Roman, Arco et al. teaches away from the present invention by teaching use of bonded webs and films. Therefore, whatever Arco et al. may teach about fan-folded forms of medical cover sheets, this reference fails to teach or supply the above-identified significant differences that are present between the present claims and disclosure of Price et al.

In view of at least the above, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is not obvious over Price et al. and Arco et al.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection Based On Price et al. and West et al.

In paragraph 13 at pages 7-8 of the Office Action, Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price et al. as applied to claim 11, and further in view of West et al. (U.S. 6,488,222).

This rejection is moot as claim 21 is not currently pending. In any event, whatever West et al. may teach about providing a roll of C-folded bags interconnected by lines of perforations to separate bags at a later time, this reference fails to teach or supply the above-identified significant differences that are present between the present claims and disclosure of Price et al.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and notice of such is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that a teleconference would be useful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the official is kindly invited to contact the applicants' undersigned representative of record.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ramon R. Hoch/

Ramon R. Hoch, Reg. #34108

Date: October 24, 2007

Direct Correspondence To:  
Customer Number 62753

Valerie Calloway, Esq.  
Polymer Group, Inc.  
9335 Harris Corners Parkway, Suite 300  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28269  
(704) 697-5177